

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP
2 Charles H. Samel (SBN 182019)
3 633 West Fifth Street, Suite 4000
4 Los Angeles, California 90071-2007
5 Telephone: (213) 485-1234
6 Facsimile: (213) 891-8763
7 charles.samel@lw.com

5
6 Attorneys for Defendants
7 ATI Technologies, Inc. and
Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10
11 RHONDA ALDRICH, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14
15 NVIDIA CORPORATION; ATI
16 TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; and ADVANCED
MICRO DEVICES, INC.

17 Defendants.

18 Case No. C-06-07494 WHA

CLASS ACTION

**STIPULATED REQUEST TO CONTINUE
CASE MANAGEMENT AND ADR
DEADLINES; [PROPOSED] ORDER**

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

19
20 Plaintiff Rhonda Aldrich (“Plaintiff”) and Defendants Nvidia Corporation
21 (“Nvidia”), ATI Technologies, Inc. and Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. (collectively “AMD”)
22 hereby jointly request the Court to continue the initial case management conference and related
23 deadlines in this action as follows.

24 1. On December 6, 2006, Plaintiff filed the Complaint based on diversity
25 jurisdiction. The Complaint alleges claims under state antitrust and consumer protection laws.
26 Plaintiff styled the Complaint as a putative class action.

27 2. As of the date of this Stipulation, at least 30 other complaints have been
28 filed in this and other judicial districts. All of these complaints allege federal antitrust claims

1 and/or state law antitrust claims against Nvidia and AMD. Each complaint is styled as a putative
 2 class action.

3 3. On December 8, 2006, plaintiffs in some of these other actions
 4 collectively filed a motion before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation (“JPML”) to
 5 transfer and consolidate in this judicial district all existing and subsequently filed antitrust
 6 actions related to the claims alleged in the Complaint.

7 4. On January 16, 2007, AMD and Nvidia filed a response with the JPML
 8 supporting consolidation and transfer of these actions to the Northern District of California, San
 9 Jose Division, or, in the alternative, in the Northern District of California, San Francisco
 10 Division. To date, every party responding to the JPML Motion has supported consolidation and
 11 transfer in either the Northern or Central Districts of California. No party has opposed
 12 consolidation and transfer.

13 5. Oral argument on the JPML Motion is scheduled for March 29, 2007 in
 14 San Antonio, Texas. The parties agree that, at some point subsequent to that hearing, the JPML
 15 is likely to order transfer and consolidation of these actions.

16 6. In light of these facts, Plaintiff and Defendants stipulated in December
 17 2006 to extend the time for Defendants to respond to the Complaint to 30 days after (1) the order
 18 resolving the JPML motion and (2) the filing and service of any subsequent consolidated
 19 complaint, without prejudice to the right of Nvidia or AMD to seek additional time to answer or
 20 otherwise respond to the Complaint for good cause shown.

21 7. Given the March 29, 2007 hearing date before the JPML, the dates set
 22 forth in the Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference and ADR Deadlines entered on
 23 December 6, 2006 (“December 6 Order”), including the deadlines imposed by Federal Rules of
 24 Civil Procedure 26, Local Rule 16, and ADR Local Rule 3.5, will come to pass before the JPML
 25 acts on the pending motion.

26 8. Continuing the dates set forth in the December 6 Order would avoid the
 27 expenditure of unnecessary judicial resources until it is determined whether this action will
 28

1 remain pending in this Court. It would also ensure consistency in pretrial rulings and be
 2 convenient for the parties, including Plaintiff.

3 9. Accordingly, the parties hereby stipulate to and respectfully request that
 4 the Court order a continuance of the dates set forth in the December 6 Order. The affected dates
 5 include (1) the deadline to meet and confer re: initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process
 6 selection, and discovery plan (currently March 2, 2007); (2) file joint ADR documents (currently
 7 March 2, 2007); and (3) complete initial disclosures and file the Rule 26(f) Report (currently
 8 March 16, 2007). Pursuant to the February 14, 2007 Order, this Court has already re-scheduled
 9 the Initial Case Management Conference (initially set for March 23, 2007) for May 24, 2007, and
 10 has ordered that the parties shall submit a joint case management conference statement not less
 11 than seven days prior to the conference.

12 10. The parties request that the Court continue the above referenced schedule
 13 as follows: (1) the deadline to meet and confer re: initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR
 14 process selection, and discovery plan – May 3, 2007; (2) file joint ADR documents – May 3,
 15 2007; and (3) complete initial disclosures and file the Rule 26(f) Report – May 17, 2007. Such a
 16 continuance will allow this matter to move forward promptly in the event that the JPML Motion
 17 is denied and further proceedings before this Court are necessary.

18 11. Except as described in Paragraph 6, the parties have sought no previous
 19 modification of the timing of any event or deadline set by the Court.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

12. The parties agree to notify the Court promptly when the Panel rules on the JPM Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 20, 2007

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

By: /s/ Charles H. Samel
Charles H. Samel (182019)

Attorneys for Defendants
ATI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. and
ADVANCED MICRO DEVICES, INC.

Dated: February 20, 2007
COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP

Dated: February 20, 2007
SCHUBERT & REED LLP

By: /s/ James Donato
James Donato (146140)

By: /s/ Aaron H. Darsky
Aaron H. Darsky (212229)

**Attorneys for Defendant
NVIDIA CORPORATION**

Attorneys for Plaintiff
RHONDA ALDRICH

1 FILER'S ATTESTATION:

2 Pursuant to General Order No. 45, § X(B) regarding signatures, I attest under penalty of
3 perjury that the concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from its signatories.

4 Dated: February 20, 2007

5 By: /s/ Charles H. Samel
Charles H. Samel

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 [PROPOSED] ORDER

2 Pursuant to the stipulation of the parties, all dates set forth in the December 6,
3 2006 Order Setting Initial Case Management Conference are hereby continued as follows: (1) the
4 deadline to meet and confer re: initial disclosures, early settlement, ADR process selection, and
5 discovery plan will be May 3, 2007; (2) the deadline to file joint ADR documents will be May 3,
6 2007; and (3) the deadline to complete initial disclosures and file the Rule 26(f) Report will be
7 May 17, 2007. The parties are ordered to notify the Court promptly when the Judicial Panel on
8 Multidistrict Litigation rules upon the motion for consolidation pending in MDL Docket No.
9 1826, *In re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litigation*.

10 Pursuant to stipulation, it is so ordered.

11 Dated: February 21, 2007

12 The Honorable William H. Alsup
13 
14

15 LA\1688017.1